

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR.

90-7225

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR.

90-7226

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EAST-
ERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

IN RE JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR.

90-7296

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Nos. 90-7225, 90-7226 AND 90-7296. Decided April 29, 1991

PER CURIAM.

Petitioner has filed a petition for a writ of certiorari, No. 90-7226, a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, No. 90-7225, and a petition for a writ of mandamus, No. 90-7296, all seeking relief from a single order of a lower court, which in turn denied petitioner leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and barred petitioner from making further *in forma pauperis* filings seeking certain extraordinary writs. We deny the petition for a writ of certiorari in No. 90-7226.

Petitioner has made 32 *in forma pauperis* filings in this Court since the beginning of the October 1988 Term, many of which challenge sanctions imposed by lower courts in response to petitioner's frivolous filings. Petitioner's method of seeking relief here—filing three petitions for relief from a single order of a lower court—could only be calculated to disrupt the orderly consideration of cases. Petitioner has abused the system, and we find it appropriate to deny leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* to petitioner in these two peti-

tions for extraordinary relief, Nos. 90-7225 and 90-7296, and in all future petitions for extraordinary relief. See *In re Sindram*, — U. S. — (No. 90-6051, January 7, 1991); *In re McDonald*, 489 U. S. 180 (1989).

If petitioner wishes to have one or both of these petitions considered on its merits, he must pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and submit a petition in compliance with Rule 33 of the Rules of this Court before May 20, 1991. The Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions from petitioner for extraordinary writs unless he pays the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) and submits his petition in compliance with Rule 33. Petitioner remains free under the present order to file *in forma pauperis* requests for relief other than an extraordinary writ, if he qualifies under this Court's Rule 39 and does not similarly abuse that privilege.

It is so ordered.